

BEFORE THE PERSONNEL APPEALS BOARD

STATE OF WASHINGTON

ROXANNE HEISTER,

Appellant,

v.

COLUMBIA BASIN COLLEGE,

Respondent.

Case No. ALLO-01-0017

ORDER OF THE BOARD FOLLOWING
HEARING ON EXCEPTIONS TO THE
DETERMINATION OF THE DIRECTOR

Hearing on Exceptions. This appeal came on for hearing before the Personnel Appeals Board, GERALD L. MORGEN, Vice Chair, and LEANA D. LAMB, Member, on Appellant's exceptions to the director's determination dated May 17, 2001. The hearing was held in the Administration Building of the Columbia Basin College, Pasco, Washington. WALTER T. HUBBARD, Chair, did not participate in the hearing or in the decision in this matter.

Appearances. Appellant Roxanne Heister was present and was represented by Leslie Liddle, Employee Relations Specialist for the Washington Public Employees Association. Ruben Lemos, Associate Dean of Human Resources, represented Respondent Columbia Basin College.

Background. Appellant submitted a Position Questionnaire (PQ) requesting that her position as a Library Technician III be reallocated to the class of Library Specialist I or II. Ruben Lemos conducted a position audit and by letter dated February 23, 2001, he informed Appellant of his determination that her position was properly allocated to the class of Library Technician III. By letter dated February 26, 2001, Appellant appealed this determination to the director of the

1 Department of Personnel. On April 11, 2001, Tammy C. Tee, Human Resource Consultant,
2 conducted a telephonic verification interview and by letter dated May 17, 2001, she informed
3 Appellant that her position was properly allocated. On June 18, 2001, Appellant filed exceptions to
4 the determination of the Department of Personnel (DOP).

5
6 Appellant works in the Technical Processing department at the Columbia Basin College Library.
7 The college library houses the Benton/Franklin Law Library, which is open to students as well as
8 the public. Appellant is the primary individual overseeing the law library.

9
10 **Summary of Appellant's Argument.** Appellant takes exception to the director's determination
11 that she does not use intense knowledge and skills necessary to perform complex library tasks
12 within the law library. Appellant asserts that DOP failed to consider the full weight of knowledge
13 and skills necessary to perform complex technical duties associated with cataloging of library
14 materials and that DOP incorrectly determined the level of supervision she performs under.
15 Appellant asserts that because the library is small, she is required to have expertise in a variety of
16 areas rather than specializing in only one. Appellant contends that she has sole responsibility and
17 discretion to determine where, when and how to purchase acquisitions. She further asserts that
18 none of these bills are paid until she approves them for payment. Appellant argues that she works
19 independently, that her work is reviewed only for effectiveness and that she organizes her own
20 work and devises her own work methods.

21
22 Appellant asserts that the duties she performs are clearly complex library tasks in which she uses an
23 intense application of skills and knowledge within the law library and acquisitions, a specific
24 subject area, and cataloging, a specialized functional area. Appellant, therefore, contends that her
25 position meets the intent or level of responsibility envisioned by the Library Specialist I
26 classification.

1
2 **Summary of Respondent's Argument.** Respondent asserts that Appellant, in conjunction with
3 two other employees, performs tasks that are technical in nature. Respondent argues that because
4 the library staff is cross-trained, the multiple duties Appellant performs are in support of the overall
5 library functions. Respondent asserts that neither the cataloging duties nor the law library duties
6 Appellant performs meet the criteria necessary for allocation to the Library Specialist I or II
7 classifications. Respondent contends that Appellant is not a member of the law library committee
8 but serves as an advisor along with the dean of the library to discuss, monitor and provide guidance
9 and suggestions to the board who has final decision making authority. Respondent argues that
10 Appellant's position is appropriately allocated to the Library Technician III.

11
12 **Primary Issue.** Whether the director's determination that Appellant's position is properly allocated
13 to the Library Technician III classification should be affirmed.

14
15 **Relevant Classifications.** Library Technician III, class code 4327; Library Specialist I, class code
16 4310; Library Specialist II, class code 4311.

17
18 **Decision of the Board.** The purpose of a position review is to determine which classification best
19 describes the overall duties and responsibilities of a position. A position review is neither a
20 measurement of the volume of work performed, nor an evaluation of the expertise with which that
21 work is performed. Also, a position review is not a comparison of work performed by employees in
22 similar positions. A position review is a comparison of the duties and responsibilities of a particular
23 position to the available classification specifications. This review results in a determination of the
24 class that best describes the overall duties and responsibilities of the position. Liddle-Stamper v.
25 Washington State University, PAB Case No. 3722-A2 (1994).

1 The Basic Function of a position allocated to the Library Specialist I is as follows:

2 Perform complex library technical tasks using intensive application of knowledge
3 and skills in a specific library functional area such as public services, acquisitions,
4 cataloging, serials, interlibrary loan, special collections, and reference or in a
5 specific subject area such as Asian Studies, Northwest Literature, American
History, and Music.

6 The Basic Function of a position allocated to the Library Specialist II is as follows:

7
8 Perform original cataloging or participate in the development, cataloging,
9 organization, and management of a specialized subject or functional library
collection.

10
11 The class series concept for the Library Specialist specifications requires that the incumbent in the
12 position serve as a specialist in a specific library functional or subject area and utilizing complex
13 automated subsystems to provide specialized information.

14
15 Both students and the general public use Benton/Franklin Law Library materials. Katie Foley,
16 Dean of Library Services, and Appellant work in conjunction with the Law Library Committee.
17 The Committee is responsible for making decisions regarding library acquisitions and changes.
18 Appellant's responsibilities include overseeing the law library; providing information to the
19 Committee about usage and costs; making purchase recommendations, creating reports and
20 statistics and performing research functions for the Committee. Appellant, with the assistance of
21 student workers, files new additions to the collection, inserts pocket parts, and updates and
22 supplements law library materials. The duties performed by Appellant in support of the law library
23 comprise only 25 percent of her work time.

24 Appellant spends another 25 percent of her work time performing preliminary cataloging and
25 processing tasks. While Appellant performs some cataloging changes, these changes, however, are
26

1 for pagination purposes. Original cataloging and records needing major revisions are given to the
2 catalog librarian. Appellant does not participate in the development, cataloging, organization, and
3 management of the law library.

4
5 Appellant spends 25 percent of her work time performing acquisitions tasks. The Library Dean is
6 responsible for authorizing all book orders. Appellant spend 15 percent of her time performing
7 some interlibrary loans duties, however, interlibrary loans are primarily processed by the reference
8 librarian. The remainder of Appellant's time is spent performing other duties, including database
9 processing for daily/monthly circulation reports. Appellant is as a backup for the circulation desk.

10
11 Appellant's position does not fit the overall duties and responsibilities necessary to be classified to
12 the Library Specialist I or II classifications.

13
14 The Basic Function of the Library Technician III classification is to perform library technical tasks
15 in support of the overall library function. The Distinguishing Characteristics include working under
16 general supervision, using manual and/or automated systems, performing complex library technical
17 tasks such as assisting clients with general reference and bibliographic questions, performing
18 complex circulation and collection maintenance functions, searching and verifying library material
19 orders and receipts, locating and revising catalog copy, and inputting/updating records and
20 maintaining the operations of a library unit. Typical work includes assisting clients with general
21 reference and bibliographic questions; searching and verifying library material orders and receipts;
22 preparing and/or interpreting bibliographic listings; cataloging library materials; inputting and/or
23 revising catalog records and library material orders, purchase orders and invoices; arranging,
24 indexing and inventorying special materials; performing complex circulation services; and
25 performing interlibrary loan borrowing and lending procedures.

1 The overall duties and responsibilities described in Appellant's position questionnaire are
2 encompassed by and best described by the Library Technician III classification.

3
4 **Conclusion.** The appeal on exceptions by Appellant should be denied and the Director's
5 determination dated May 17, 2001, should be affirmed and adopted.

6
7 **ORDER**

8 NOW, THEREFORE, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that the appeal on exceptions by Roxanne
9 Heister is denied and the attached Director's determination dated May 17, 2001, is affirmed and
10 adopted.

11
12 DATED this _____ day of _____, 2001.

13 WASHINGTON STATE PERSONNEL APPEALS BOARD

14
15 _____
16 Gerald L. Morgen, Vice Chair

17 _____
18 Leana D. Lamb, Member